



Social Questions Bulletin

49

JANUARY, 1959

Number 1

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, founded in 1907, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation stands for the complete abolition of war. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives, the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decisions, not by violence.

U. S. Foreign Policy: Next Phases

By THOMAS K. FINLETTER*

Chinese challenges (rapid power growth of U.S.S.R. and China, Asian Revolution, and) especially the menace of atomic bombs, put upon U.S. foreign policy makers a new imperative, absolute necessity of not allowing war, of creating a world in which will exclude war from human affairs. U.S. foreign policy has not accepted this new imperative. No policy is considered proper unless and until our leaders and the people do accept it.

War until atomic weapons, was irrational and primitive, accepted as inevitable in a world in which the only law governing relations between nations was of the jungle. Basic premise of all pre-atomic foreign policy was war might happen at any time. It was the duty of statesmen to be ready, build up alliance, keep up military strength, and weaken possible enemies. American statesmen now must do away with war they are compelled to reject the basic premises of all previous foreign policy and invent and gain acceptance for wholly new methods and concepts in our international dealings.

Many say all we have to do to prevent war is keep up our present air-atomic power, atomic bombs, airplanes, and missiles. Statesmen, including those of the U.S., have been eloquent about the danger of atomic stalemate, not in words but in deeds, by lack of any sense of urgency in striking at conditions which bring war to this. This (alleged atomic stalemate) is not the way it is. During about 1960 Russians will be superior to us in air-atomic power because they will have many more intercontinental ballistic missiles. Russia and China or some other country may reach the point when they could destroy us without our being able to destroy them in return. There is always possibility of mistake, small war expanding into big war which no one wants or, in case of push-button warfare, when some lunatic or believer in preventive war might start up the whole machinery of destruction. In fact, likelihood of war is going to increase. China is going to get atomic weapons. China and Russia, as well as we, will become armed with means of destruction even more dreadful than the hydrogen bomb. There is public discussion of use of space for war and other fantastic—but perhaps practical—ideas such as control of the weather of the polar ice cap. We are about to see mutations in weapons of war as radical or more than development of atomic weapons. Then we cannot tell what attitudes of other countries may be. We have heard Mao Tse Tung believes China with its six hundred million people will sustain hydrogen war, lose three hundred million, and come out of the war the strongest country on earth. We had better stop consoling ourselves that the possibility of war has disappeared. We would do better to get busy to do everything to save ourselves and the world from the war which looms so menacingly before us.

Tensions and Tensions

Disarmament negotiations between World War I and II have since, show you cannot get agreement on disarmament without progress in reducing tensions between nations. Agree-

*Sec'y of U.S. Air Force, excerpts from address at National Council of Churches' World Order Study Conference, Cleveland, November 19.

ment on disarmament is out of the question unless simultaneously, as you negotiate for control of armaments, you build a world climate which makes possible agreement to disarm. Fundamental purpose of U.S. foreign policy should be to try to create this climate while moving into energetic negotiations for stage-by-stage enforced control and elimination of weapons. The arms-race itself is a major factor in building tensions and creating a bad climate of world opinion.

The New Relations Needed With Asia and Africa

The West and Asia and Africa will have better chance of keeping their freedom and not having the horror of war if they work together rather than in antagonism or indifference. We have made mistake in putting so much emphasis on defense treaties, military aid and military threats in our efforts to contain the advance of communism in Asia. We must give up our emphasis on military treaties and military measures generally, in Asia. We also will have to stop acting unilaterally in Asia and rely more on the United Nations. We will have to abandon power politics, with its lack of respect for lawfulness and act more in accord with principles on which we and the peoples of Asia are agreed. Our reliance on militarism in Asia was product of that monopoly and near-monopoly in atomic weapons which the U.S. possessed until a few years ago. Because we feel militarily safe in doing so we extruded our military power outside our own society and into Asia and Africa. Extension of military power by the West into Asia and Africa is precisely the definition of colonialism, and is a sure way of losing friends and influence. The same is true of the West's making unilateral decisions which affect the peoples of Asia—as we have in Indo-China and Formosa. This is a carry-over of the colonial days when Westerners were accustomed to making decisions for the indigenous peoples of Asia without consulting them. This, too, is no way to understanding and sympathy between the West and Asia. If we are to have good understanding with the peoples of Asia and Africa we have to give up these practices. This would require us, as a beginning, to give up or change the nature of the Baghdad Pact, and SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In both treaties Western military power was extended into a society in which it did not belong. Purpose of the Baghdad Pact, from our point of view, like the Eisenhower Doctrine which followed it, was to build a line of defense against Russian overt military invasion of the Near East—which in fact was quite the least of the threats to independence of the countries in the Near East. To the people of the Near East the Baghdad Pact seemed like use of Western military power to dominate the political life of the people who live there. So, too, with SEATO. From the military view SEATO is not effective. It, like the Baghdad Pact is based on the out-of-date concept of defending against the least likely form of communist aggression—direct military invasion. It too is looked upon by the peoples of Asia as injection of Western military power where it does not belong. SEATO makes many Asians doubt the West has learned days of Western military power in Asia for dominating Asia are at an end.

The Baghdad and Southeast Asia Treaties are not the only

things in our Asian policy which should be changed. We should liquidate the rest of our emphasis on military treaties and measures generally. Massive retaliation ceased to be possible militarily (and was always unwise foreign policy) when Russians developed ability to retaliate massively themselves, and said they would support their Chinese partners if war came. But military threats, and variations of massive retaliation—such as threats of using tactical atomic weapons—are still part of our foreign policy in the Formosa area. Formosa is case *par excellence* of injection of U.S. military power into Asian affairs in the old manner of the colonial era. We are only one of the forty-eight signatories of the Japanese Peace Treaty of 1945 by which Japan gave up Formosa. Yet, we alone, with the Nationalists, are defending Formosa and asserting the right to decide her future. This is dangerous and unwise. We may find ourselves in war with the combined Russians and Chinese over Formosa or adjacent islands, with no major allies to help us. We should call upon the United Nations to take over from us defense and decision as to ultimate sovereignty of Formosa and adjacent islands.

For non-communist Asia and Africa the best is to help them make success of their newly won independence—i.e., help makes the Afro-Asian Revolution a success. Recently there has been change for the better. The Development Loan Fund has been set up as a new item in our foreign economic aid. There is increased emphasis on raising standards of living in Asia and Africa, rather than providing armaments. Nevertheless, concern of the U.S. and the West with the intolerably low standards of living in many under-developed areas, particularly South and Southeast Asia, seems quite inadequate. Our aid is too much a response to the Russian economic initiative in Asia rather than a positive program of our own. It won't do just to meet Russian bids and let peoples of these areas think we help them only to the extent we have to to counteract communist influence. We ought to be intolerant of sub-standard conditions of living in Asia and Africa, say to ourselves it is impossible for a rich country to live side-by-side with poverty such as in India; where in some provinces annual *per capita* income is less than \$100. Greatest part of our federal expenditures is for war. Our expenditures for warfare and peace represent a very, very small part of the total budget. Over 85 per cent of our federal budget is for war, past or future, the bulk going for arms for a war we hope will not come. With annual U.S. expenditures of over \$50 billion for war we can well afford considerably more than the less than \$1 billion we currently spend on foreign economic aid.

A Plan to End East-West Suspicion

We have to get a better atmosphere between Russia and communist China and ourselves, coexistence, an understanding and implied agreement between us and the communists to work out world conditions to live together on this planet and do everything to prevent our rivalries from resulting in war, a very much better climate of opinion between them and us and the rest of the world. All students of Russian relations with the West agree a main trouble between us is mutual suspicion. Important is to try to get rid of mutual suspicions. Best way to do this is for the U.S. to do what it has never done before: simultaneously with effort to reduce tensions generally, propose full-scale disarmament, complete in all stages down to the final one—a plan protected at each stage so we will not be in a worse position than at the start if there is breach of agreement by any other country. The Russians could prove they also do not want war by negotiating seriously such a disarmament offer. It is not at all sure we would be willing to make such offer. Would we really be willing to disarm at all—no matter how sure we might be of guarantees that in so doing we did not weaken our relative position to Russia?

China Recognition Required for Disarmament and Peace

If, as some Americans insist, we must never recognize Red China no matter how much it might be to the advantage of the U.S. to do so, we must abandon the idea of disarmament as impossible. But if we put interests of our country first, to say nothing of the cause of peace, then disarmament must include recognition of Red China at some stage. We had better stop talking about disarmament and indeed peace unless we abandon

the attitude that China recognition is something we will never accept. This approach must be made to have a foreign policy which really attacks the problem of war.

Replace International Lawlessness with Law

Our quietism comes because of inertia produced by centuries of lawlessness in relations between states. The nation-state and its predecessor forms have been with us for several thousand years. During this time powerful creeds have been built up to bolster up the state and enable it to defend itself in a lawless world in which it lives. Many of these creeds are good such as patriotism and the willingness to sacrifice for the state. Some are bad, such as the notion that foreigners are barbarians or peculiar, untrustworthy people. It will be an enormous task to weaken these powerful creeds (based on the fact international life is lawless) and persuade peoples and governments to accept beginnings of world law. We have no choice other than to believe we may work out a world in which we will not destroy each other and do everything we individually can to achieve such a world.

This is a problem for government officials. But in a representative democracy such as ours, government can act only with support and sometimes only on the initiative of public opinion. If we all talk and think enough about these things our country may rise to the great challenge and do its share in leading mankind to sanity and peace.

CHRISTIAN LEADERS ASK CHINA RECOGNITION

In Cleveland in late November was held the Fifth World Order Study Conference, sponsored by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., which represents 27 major Protestant and six Eastern Orthodox denominations. Along with the others, The Methodist Church had official representation. After extended discussion and study, "The 500 delegate leaders of American Protestantism, voted unanimously in favor of United States recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations," (NY Times, 11-22-58) the same statement taken earlier this year (and in prior years) by the national Methodist Federation for Social Action Membership Meeting. The Cleveland delegates voted:

With reference to China, Christians should urge reconsideration of government of its policy in regard to the People's Republic of China. While the rights of Taiwan and Korea should be safeguarded, steps should be taken toward inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and its recognition by our government. Such recognition does not imply approval. These diplomatic relations should constitute part of a much wider relationship between our peoples. Exclusion of the effective government on the mainland of China, currently the People's Republic of China, from the international community is many ways a disadvantage to that community. It helps preserve a false image of the United States and of other nations in the minds of the Chinese people. It keeps our people in ignorance of what is taking place in China. It hampers negotiations for disarmament. It limits the function of international organizations. We have a strong hope that the resumption of relationships between the peoples of China and of the United States may make possible also restoration of relationships between their churches and ours.

CHINA'S HARVEST—1958'S GREAT EVENT

By René Dumont*

Instead of 185 million tons of basic foodstuffs as in 1957 the 1958 crop is estimated today at between 300 and 350 million tons. Raw cotton should reach 3.5 million tons, double the 1957 figure. Until last year there was acute shortage of fats in China. Soya, at 12.5 million tons, shows increase of "only" 10 per cent, but peanuts, at six million tons, have risen 124 per cent; the latter's oil content is more than double that of soya. At 10 million tons, wheat shows increase of 70 per cent, outstripping the United States for the first time and closely approaching the Soviet Union. Semi-late rice, at 56.5 million tons, increased "only" 40 per cent.

* Prof. of Comparative Agriculture, Agronomic Institute, Paris. A leading Western authority on Asia agriculture. We print excerpts from *Montclair Review's* translation from *Le Monde*, 10-12-58.

increase of 60 to 90 per cent in the harvest in one year, for "continent" the size of China, is a phenomenon absolutely without precedent in the world's agricultural history. . . . Between 1940 and 1944, output in the U.S. was expanding most rapidly, agricultural production increased about 40 per cent by use of land which had been allowed to lie fallow, of underused tractors, and of fertilizer factories which had been working at 50 per cent of capacity.

How was China's increase of 60 to 90 per cent attained? In 1949, China had 53 million acres of irrigated land, already an enormous task of organization spread over more than two thousand years. In 1955-56 irrigated area had risen to 66 million acres and then increased in one year by 19.7 million acres, a phenomenon also without precedent. In the campaign of 1957-58 alone, under irrigation is reported to have been further extended over 74.1 million acres. Thus, more was achieved in 15 or 20 months than had previously been achieved in two thousand years. This increase was more than double the 34.6 million acres taken over a century to irrigate in the U.S. which had much less mechanical power than China. Fifty-six per cent or 160.5 million acres of the 286.5 million acres under cultivation appear irrigated. Irrigation is the decisive factor to explain such rapid increase in output. Irrigation raises yields and makes them more regular; it also makes annual double cropping possible, increases both employment and the size of the harvest.

Use of fertilizers was apparently the second factor contributing to the huge 1958 harvest. Since the chemical industry does not yet have a wide base, recourse was had to all possible sources of natural and organic fertilizer: dead leaves, green manure, waste, sea, night soil, plant and fish waste, and above all mud taken from ditches and canals, small lakes, and ponds, and rich clay mined on men's backs from the main river beds. Fertilizer per acre is reported 130 to 150 tons or ten times more than last year.

In 1955, the Chinese peasant worked between 50 and 220 days in the fields according to the region, an average of perhaps 100 days. In many parts of the country, he now works more than 200 days; slogan of China in 1958 is shortage of manpower, not in the country there are only two days rest a month. Owing to excessive authoritarianism and too low prices, the USSR until 1953 and the People's Democracies to this day, failed to a large extent in their agricultural policy. Reaction of the Chinese peasants confronted by massive collectivization of the winter of 1955-56 has so far been an enigma. Without the active and voluntary participation of the majority, the mountains would not have been terraced nor the terraces held in place by gravel, nor the gravel humped, basket by basket, from the river beds. It is an impression that the Chinese Party has succeeded in marrying authority to the peasants' consent after due deliberation, a consent obtained by protracted "explanations."

China now has about half a ton of grain per head compared with 27 pounds in 1957. She has thus gone beyond Europe in grain but remains far behind in animal products. Last June, Chairman Mao, taking account of the promising harvest, fixed targets for 1959 or 1960: 1650 pounds of grain (basic food-stuffs), 110 pounds of pork, 22 pounds of vegetable oil and 22 pounds of cotton fiber per head—this only a beginning, he added. This would put China, in a year or two, at a nutritional level halfway between Western and Eastern Europe, soon catching up to the Soviet Union.

Small country blast furnaces produce iron, cast iron, and steel with much labor, but need much less iron for their construction than big blast furnaces. . . . At the beginning of 1958 it was proposed to build 13,000 blast furnaces during the year. By the end of July there were already 45,000, producing 3,300 tons of iron per day; there were 350,000 on September 10, and twenty million countrymen and women were employed directly in the iron and steel industry. Production of iron and steel should rise from 5.3 million tons in 1957 to 10.7 million tons in 1958; 20 million tons, or more than France's output, is projected for 1959. As in agriculture, so in industry all targets are upset month by month in China today. The collective farm has given way to the people's commune,

which frees the countrywomen from housework and from looking after children, and releases them on a vast scale for productive work. Within this framework, education at all levels can also develop widely. In front of a rural school, during school hours, one can see draught animals, carts, wagons, and hoes belonging to peasant scholars, who also do their day's work and will take up their tools as they leave. If we do not look out, Chinese peasants' cultural level may well outstrip France's in less than a generation.

The Chinese harvest of 1958 is the year's greatest event, as the Sputnik was of 1957—irrefutable proof that investment of labor is the most important source of savings for all underdeveloped countries which obviously have inadequate financial resources. With transition from cooperative to people's commune, which now owns the land and all means of production, the small plots having been abolished . . . conditions now make possible vast increase in output. . . . Certain laws of agricultural economics need reappraisal. A number of Chinese cooperatives are said to have doubled their working days and more than doubled their output in a year, pushing back much further than we thought possible the threshold of the economic law of diminishing returns. Under Italian agrarian reform, output could often only be doubled by quadrupling the amount of labor per hectare. Three years ago I underlined the importance of the challenge posed to the West by the transformation of Chinese agriculture. However, far from appreciating the scale of this transformation, I was not sure it would be possible to achieve China's Twelve Year Plan, 1956-1967, aimed at raising agricultural production two and one-half times in this period. Actual rate of growth is already faster than that and proceeds in an atmosphere of "uninterrupted revolution" which never experienced retreat towards any kind of NEP.

Of course, I cannot hold myself personally responsible for the absolute accuracy of all these figures, though they are official. At the same time, the amount of information collected is sufficiently consistent for me to assert on my own responsibility that what is happening in China is the most impressive agricultural advance in world history.

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

Recently the German question has displaced the Chinese question in the front page headlines. This was due to Khrushchev's proposal to make West Berlin a free city, permanently disarmed; also to withdraw Soviet troops from Berlin and expect the Big Three to do likewise. He also reiterated the Soviet desire to have all foreign troops withdrawn from Germany and let the Germans decide their future in their own way.

On this issue our program, adopted by the recent annual membership meeting, proposes that the first item on the agenda of a summit meeting of the big powers be "unification and democratization of Germany by means of free nationwide elections within the neutralization pattern negotiated for Austria by the Western allies and the Soviet Union. This would mean a United Germany, free from all foreign troops from East and West alike."

Free elections is the big selling phrase of our government's united Germany program. In view of our record in Italy and France in establishing the kind of elections that deprive com-

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year

25c per copy

Issued monthly, October through May, and one summer issue.

METHODIST FEDERATION for SOCIAL ACTION
An unofficial fellowship founded in 1907.

President, Dr. Loyd F. Worley; Vice-Presidents, Rev. Frederick E. Ball, Rev. Lee H. Ball, Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson, Rev. Elwin E. Wilson; Recording Secretaries, Mrs. Ella Mulkey, Miss Janice Roberts; Treasurer, Rev. Edward L. Peet.

Membership and West Coast Field Secretary, Rev. Mark A. Chamberlain
Editor, "Social Questions Bulletin," Rev. Jack R. McMichael

Editorial Office and Office of Publication
P. O. Box 327, Gresham, Oregon.

51

Re-entered as second class matter Sept. 15, 1953, at the Postoffice at Gresham, Oregon, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

munists and left socialists of the legislative representation their numbers formerly entitled them to, it behooves us to find out just what kind of elections the State Department have in mind. Since West Germany has about three times the population of East Germany, the situation is made to order for a policy whose basic desire is the prevention and reversal of socialist nationalization of heavy industry and the social services, under the deceptive cloak of extending the "free world."

Khrushchev recently told 250 Soviet and foreign correspondents that Moscow did not indulge in the "fantasy" that West Germany could be persuaded to become socialist, and the West should not cling to its "fantasies" that East Germany could be made capitalist. He was proposing an attempt at peaceful co-existence.

The moral ground for our support of democracy is that the democratic process is the working out in political relations of the principles of the second Great Commandment and the Golden Rule. In determining our positions on the German, Chinese and Soviet issues we need to remember that this working out is an ongoing development. Capitalist democracy is only a stage not a final form. The next step extends democratic controls to economic behaviour. This is more complex than voting in elections. It will require differing forms in nations, according to the difference in industrial development. Also political forms able to meet the needs of changed economic behaviour.

For example, the Soviet peoples make their choice of legislative representatives almost entirely in the nominations, on the basis of the qualifications shown by persons they have worked with, or seen closely in local government. There, and not in the elections, is the real contest. The test is whether with a socialist economy this procedure expresses most effectively the will of the most people. This is the kind of question involved in the recommendation sent down, for lack of time, to our members by the annual meeting for consideration: "The study by every local church and congregation to see the moral and spiritual values underlying our and other economic systems, and then to assume the related responsibilities."

There is a wider and deeper issue involved in the German question. Our government wants a united Germany armed with nuclear weapons as the core of NATO's European fighting strength. With our aid, 15 battalions are now being equipped with "dual purpose" weapons for which we will supply nuclear warheads if and when needed. In a recent interview with the N.Y. Times top European correspondent, their Minister of Defense said: "West Germany will not be deflected from its continuing program to build a modern atomic army within the Atlantic alliance—either by Soviet bribes or blackmail. Our troops are NATO troops. They will obey alliance policy . . . We will take no national decision on disarmament any more than we took a national decision on rearmament."

This statement shows us the cold war forces marching once more to the brink behind Dulles. Once again the possibility of avoiding mutual annihilation, and getting a disarmed world that will study war no more, is reduced to a smaller possibility. This is what the Soviet people, who lost thirty times as many people in World War II as we did, are so anxious to avoid. This is why their leaders want a demilitarized, neutralized Germany.

This menace of a nuclear rearmed Germany calls us to consider the plans now being offered for a neutral zone in central and Eastern Europe. First put before the U.N. General Assembly in October '57 by the Polish Minister it was reissued this fall. Dulles, supported by Great Britain, had to work hard against some of the smaller nations at the May meeting of NATO to get it rejected. The British Labor party has adopted a revised version. This adds to German disarmed and neutral unification, a neutral, nuclear free zone in Central Europe, with its frontiers guaranteed by a Big Four pact; the gradual withdrawal from it of all foreign troops; the withdrawal of West Germany from NATO and of the Eastern European States from the Warsaw pact.

Our members should start studying this in addition to our present program and if they agree with it, or any parts of it, begin local discussion, letting their representatives in Congress know the results.

H.F.W.

THE UPHAUS CASE

Members of Methodist Federation for Social Action aware with deep concern and interest the ruling of the U. S. Supreme Court in the important civil liberties case of Dr. Willard Uphaus, our beloved fellow-member and friend. The case was argued before our highest court on November 17. The ruling will determine whether Dr. Uphaus must serve an indefinite sentence in jail for refusing, on grounds of conscience and principle, to hand the New Hampshire's witch-hunting Attorney General (for likely defamation and harassment) a list of all guests over two summers at World Fellowship's camp. He also refused to hand over his correspondence as W.F.'s Executive Director with the summer camp's lecturers. Program at the summer camp involved has been open and published. Attendance has been encouraged by any, of howsoever differing backgrounds and viewpoints, interested in free and open discussion aimed at world understanding, peace, and brotherhood. At issue in the Willard Uphaus case are his own rights to free speech and religion, guaranteed in the Constitution's First Amendment, and the same rights of all others connected with that camp and its program to further world peace. If the Supreme Court were to permit N. H. Attorney General Wyman to persecute and smear all who seek peace in the state's World Fellowship camp or who express themselves in ways to which he and other reactionaries take exception, it would be to sanction a state-level attack on peaceful assembly and free expression of conscience assured all of us by the federal constitution. Another lesser issue in the case is whether the N. H. state legislature or Attorney General has a right to enter the field of alleged subversion preempted earlier by the federal government, according to the Supreme Court in the *Steve Nelson* case of 1956.

In the Supreme Court hearing of November 17, Attorney Royal W. France described Dr. Uphaus "an unusual type of man who takes quite literally the Sermon on the Mount," but "Mr. Wyman called Dr. Uphaus' religious interests a 'sham'." (NY Times, 11-18-58.) To that latter statement MFSA President Loyd F. Worley took vigorous exception in a letter to Mr. Wyman.

I am one who has known Dr. Uphaus longer than you and in a religious environment. While both of us ought to leave the matter of judgment to a Power greater than ourselves, I want to testify from my knowledge and observation, Dr. Uphaus has always shown himself true to the highest principles of faith as taught by the prophets and Jesus.

I am shocked to think a public servant like yourself should stoop to the level of bigoted judgment expressed in the statement quoted.

Writing in pamphlet "Social Unrest In the United States," p. 11, in 1919, Dr. Harry F. Ward said,

"I have no use for dictatorship in any way, either in government or industry or church. I have been preaching and writing democracy now for twenty years and I am not going to change my principles over night. Furthermore, I am against the theory and practice of dictatorship by the proletariat not only because I believe it is unethical, but also because I believe it to be unscientific. You cannot carry out the change to economic democracy that way, for the simple reason that you cannot control economic production efficiently in the transitional stage by means of one class alone. You have to have the cooperation of everybody that knows how to manage industry if you are going to democratize it."

Quoted p. 137 "A History of The Methodist Federation for Social Action" by Milton John Huber, Jr.

WESTERN MFSA MEETING CALLED

The active California-Nevada Conference Methodist Federation for Social Action Chapter has planned and called a supper meeting at the Tru-Blue Cafeteria just south of the Univ. of California campus in Berkeley, on Tuesday, February 3, at 5:30 p. m., first evening of the annual Earl Lectures featuring Norman Cousins and other notables. Invited to the supper meeting are all persons in the Western Jurisdiction interested in MFSA. Speaker will be Rev. Howard Carey, Los Angeles pastor and Vice-Chairman of the Southern California-Arizona Conference Board of Christian Social Relations. His topic will be: "How Integration Works In a Los Angeles Church."